



HOWARD COUNTY HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
*ELlicott City Historic District ■ LAWYERS HILL Historic District*  
3430 Courthouse Drive ■ Ellicott City, Maryland 21043

*Administered by the Department of Planning and Zoning*

www.howardcountymd.gov  
410-313-2350  
FAX 410-313-1655  
TDD 410-313-2323

## May Minutes

The fourth regular meeting for the year 2015 of the Historic Preservation Commission was held on Thursday, May 7, 2015 in the C. Vernon Gray Room located at 3430 Court House Drive, Ellicott City, Maryland.

Members present: Eileen Tennor, Chair; Allan Shad, Vice-Chair; Drew Roth, Secretary; Bruno Reich; and Erica Zoren

Members absent:

Staff present: Beth Burgess, Samantha Holmes, Lewis Taylor, Dan Bennett, and Carol Stirn

Chairperson Tennor opened the meeting at 7:00 p.m. with a statement explaining the process and rules of the meeting. Mr. Roth moved to Approve the April 2, 2015 minutes. Mr. Reich seconded. The motion was unanimously approved. At the beginning of the meeting, Ms. Burgess presented an award to Cathy Eshmont in honor of Historic Preservation Month for project of the year for Ms. Eshmont's efforts in the underground railroad in Ellicott City. Ms. Holmes presented a certificate to Joe Hauser on behalf of the County Executive for his service on the Commission.

### **PLANS FOR APPROVAL**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1. 14-40c – 3500 Manor Lane, Ellicott City, HO-22                       | 10. 15-28 – 1684 Woodstock Road, Woodstock                |
| 2. 14-70c – 8416 Elko Drive, Ellicott City, HO-866                      | 11. 15-29 – 8137 Main Street, Ellicott City (sign)        |
| 3. 14-54c & 14-56c – 8247/ 8249 Main Street, Ellicott                   | 12. 15-30 – 3431 Church Road, Ellicott City               |
| 4. 15-23 – 8137 Main Street, Ellicott City                              | 13. 15-31 – 3776 Church Road, Ellicott City               |
| 5. 15-24 – 3421 Deanwood Avenue, Ellicott City                          | 14. 15-32 – 3832 Old Columbia Pike, Ellicott City, HO-558 |
| 6. 15-25 – 3582 Church Road, Ellicott City                              |   |
| 7. 15-26 – 6011 Old Lawyers Hill Road, Elkridge                         |   |
| 8. 15-27 – 3799 Church Road, Ellicott City                              |   |
| 9. 15-21 – 3713 Old Columbia Pike, Ellicott City (continued from April) |   |

### **CONSENT AGENDA**

#### **14-40c – 3500 Manor Lane, Ellicott City, HO-22**

Final tax credit approval.

Applicant: Stephen Blaes

**Background & Scope of Work:** On July 3, 2014 the Applicant was pre-approved to make exterior repairs to the barns. The application states that \$265,000.00 was spent on eligible, pre-approved work. The Applicant seeks \$66,250.00 in final tax credits.

**Staff Comments:** The work complies with that pre-approved and the receipts add up to the requested amount.

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends Approval as submitted.

**Testimony:** There was no testimony.

**Motion:** Mr. Roth moved to Approve the application. Mr. Shad seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

**14-70c – 8416 Elko Drive, Ellicott City, HO-866**

Final tax credit approval.

Applicant: Kristin Magruder

**Background & Scope of Work:** On September 4, 2014 the Applicant was pre-approved to make interior structural repairs. The Applicant has submitted documentation that \$53,255.63 was spent on eligible, pre-approved work. The Applicant seeks \$13,313.90 in final tax credits.

**Staff Comments:** The work complies with that pre-approved and the receipts add up to the requested amount.

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends Approval as submitted.

**Testimony:** There was no testimony.

**Motion:** Mr. Roth moved to Approve the application. Mr. Shad seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

**14-54c and 14-56c – 8247 and 8249 Main Street, Ellicott City**

Final tax credit approval.

Applicant: Pauline Jacobs

**Background & Scope of Work:** The Applicant was pre-approved on August 7, 2014 to paint the exterior of the building. The Applicant has submitted documentation that \$1,675.00 was spent on eligible pre-approved work. The Applicant seeks \$418.75 in final tax credits.

**Staff Comments:** The Applicant submitted a cancelled check for \$1,260.00, although the invoice was for \$1,675.00. Staff has confirmed with the painter that the total amount paid in full was \$1,675.00 and also confirmed with the store owner that she paid a deposit as well, which would account for the discrepancy.

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends approval of the final tax credit as submitted, in the amount of \$418.75.

**Testimony:** There was no testimony.

**Motion:** Mr. Roth moved to Approve the application. Mr. Shad seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

**15-23 – 8137 Main Street, Ellicott City**

Exterior repairs for tax credit pre-approval. Façade Improvement Program funds.

Applicant: Megan Reuwer

**Background & Scope of Work:** According to MDAT the building dates to 1906. The Applicant proposes to remove the rusting, flaking black paint from the retail level iron windows surrounds and doors at the entrance to the building. The Applicant will treat the iron with an anti-rust product and repaint the ironwork black. The Applicant seeks tax credit pre-approval for the work.

**Staff Comments:** The application is considered Routine Maintenance per Chapter 5, which states that Routine Maintenance includes, “repair or replacement of roofs, gutters, siding, external doors and windows, trim, lights and other appurtenant fixtures using the same materials and design” and “painting previously painted surfaces using the same color.”

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends tax credit pre-approval for the work.

**Façade Improvement Program:** Staff will approve the application for the Façade Improvement Program based on the approval from the Historic Preservation Commission and the Maryland Historical Trust, availability of funds and receipt of two quotes for the work. If approved, Staff will issue a pre-approval letter explaining the amount approved once the final bid is received. The pre-approval is contingent upon a final approval when the work is complete and availability of funds. Work cannot begin until a Certificate of Approval and Façade Improvement Program Approval have been received.

**Testimony:** There was no testimony.

**Motion:** Mr. Roth moved to Approve the application. Mr. Shad seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

#### **15-24 – 3421 Deanwood Avenue, Ellicott City**

Exterior alterations.

Applicant: Rasika Mathias

**Background & Scope of Work:** According to MDAT the house dates to 2006. This property is located in the Woods of Park Place subdivision on Church Road. The Applicant proposes to paint the front door either Benjamin Moore Dorset Gold (HC-8) or Bryant Gold (HC-7). The colors are very similar and the Applicant has not yet decided on which shade to use.

**Staff Comments:** The application complies with Chapter 6.N recommendations, “use colors that are generally compatible with (and do not clash with) the colors used in the district, particularly on neighboring buildings...In general use calm or subdued colors, reserving bright colors for small, important details such as doors or trim.” Both colors are compatible with the color of the siding on the house and with neighboring buildings. The color is not a bright shade.

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends Approval as submitted, with the option to use either color.

**Testimony:** There was no testimony.

**Motion:** Mr. Roth moved to Approve the application. Mr. Shad seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

#### **15-25 – 3582 Church Road, Ellicott City**

Remove trees.

Applicant: Bruce Potter

**Background & Scope of Work:** According to MDAT the house dates to 1899. The Applicant proposes to remove two holly trees. The first holly tree is located very close to the historic carriage house. At the base of the tree, it is 5 feet from the house, but at the roofline it is located about 2 feet from the house.

The second holly tree proposed to be removed is located adjacent to the driveway. The application explains that the tree has been damaged due to the proximity of the driveway. The application explains they would like to remove the tree to minimize damage to the driveway and tennis court if it were to fall. The Applicant will replace it with a mature, native tree that will be set back within 15 feet of the existing holly's location.

**Staff Comments:** The Guidelines recommend against the "removal of live mature trees, unless it is necessary due to disease or to prevent damage to historic structures." The tree by the carriage house does present the possibility of damaging the structure if it were to fall. The Guidelines recommend "retain mature trees and shrubs, provide for their replacement when necessary" and "plant new trees and shrubs far enough from buildings to avoid moisture problems and damage to the buildings from falling limbs and roots as the plants grow." While the tree by the driveway is quite mature, the Applicant proposes to replace it with a tree in a more appropriate location.

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends Approval as submitted.

**Testimony:** There was no testimony.

**Motion:** Mr. Roth moved to Approve the application. Mr. Shad seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

#### **15-26 – 6011 Old Lawyers Hill Road, Elkridge**

Remove trees.

Applicant: Tom Quick

**Background & Scope of Work:** According to MDAT the house dates to 1948. The Applicant proposes to remove two tulip poplar trees. The diameter of one tree is 36 inches and the other tree is 45 inches. The Applicant would like to remove the trees because of their location in close proximity to the house and the threat of them falling on the house.

**Staff Comments:** Chapter 9.B recommends, "minimize removal of mature trees and shrubs and provide for their replacement whenever possible." The Applicant may plant trees in the future, but has no immediate plans. Regardless, the rear of the property contains many mature trees and Staff does not find the loss of these two trees will negatively impact the district. Chapter 9.B also recommends, "plant new trees and shrubs far enough from buildings to avoid moisture problems and damage to the buildings from falling limbs and roots as the plants grow." These trees were planted close to the building and have now gotten to a height that is concerning to the safety of the structure if they were to fall.

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends Approval as submitted.

**Testimony:** There was no testimony.

**Motion:** Mr. Roth moved to Approve the application. Mr. Shad seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

**15-27 – 3799 Church Road, Ellicott City**

Exterior alterations.

Applicant: Richard Blood, Trustee

**Background & Scope of Work:** According to MDAT the church dates to 1900, although the Historic Sites Inventory form dates the building to 1837. The Applicant found records that indicate the boiler room was approved for construction in April 1922. This project came before the Commission for pre-application advice in March 2015. The Applicant proposes to stabilize and improve the existing boiler room addition on the east side of the church for dry storage. The existing walls will be repaired, to include parging and filling in cracks. The east and south concrete block walls will be raised up to the level of the north wall. The walls will be raised using concrete block and all of the walls will be covered with a muted medium/dark gray DryVit stucco finish. A new standing seam metal roof will be added, which will have a medium to dark gray finish. The current roof falls from north to south, but the new roof will fall from west to east. The gable ends will be sheathed in DryVit and painted gray to match the walls. There will be minor grading around the structure as required to provide a grade away from the structure.

A new door will be added along the east wall, along with stairs and a walkway up to grade. The new exterior door will be painted gray to match the stucco walls. The new door will be a steel security door with a fan lite at the top. A black metal light will be installed adjacent to the exterior door.

The walkway and steps will be a gray Trex (or similar) decking with a pressure treated wood foundation. The existing trash storage shed will be relocated to the eastern property line and will be at a lower elevation and less visible.

There is a dogwood tree located along Church Road, which is dying and will be removed. The existing chain link fence and gate will be removed and replaced with a cedar wood picket fence stained a light to medium gray as to not stand out. The fence will be 42 inches high. The Applicant will use either a pyramid top or dog ear fence board.

**Staff Comments:** The application has not changed from the original proposal presented to the Commission, but some details have been finalized. Chapter 6.C of the Guidelines recommends, “maintain or restore original brick, stone, concrete block or stucco. Make repairs with materials that match the original as closely as possible.” However, while this addition is historic in age, it is not historically or architecturally significant. The Applicant is also unable to find a match to the concrete block. The use of DryVit stucco to cover the entire addition complies with Chapter 6.C recommendations, “when historic masonry must be replaced, it may be necessary to use modern materials if historically accurate materials cannot reasonably be used for economic or other reasons. The materials chosen should be as compatible as possible with the original.” The stucco chosen is the most appropriate material to be used to cover the addition, in order to make the needed alterations and have the repairs blend in and not be highly visible against the historic church building. The dark gray color for the DryVit was recommended by the Commission, but also complies with Chapter 6.N recommendations, “use colors appropriate to the period and style of the building” and “use colors that are generally compatible with (and do not clash with) the colors used in the district, particularly on neighboring buildings. On attached buildings, use the same colors or a coordinated color scheme whenever possible. In general use calm or subdued colors, reserving bright colors for small, important details such as doors or trim.” The replacement metal roof is also consistent with the Guidelines, as the existing roof is currently metal. The gray roof color will blend with the colors used on the rest of the addition.

The Applicant proposes to replace a wood door on the basement side level of the church with a steel

security door with a fan lite at the top. The door is not visible from the public right-of-way. Chapter 6.H states, “many historic buildings have secondary entrances not visible from streets or other properties. Where these entrances already have a modern replacement door, a new door does not necessarily need to be of a historically appropriate style.” While the existing door is wood, it is not historic. Due to the location of the door, Staff has no objection to the replacement with a steel door.

The dogwood tree is dying, which according to Chapter 9.C does not require a Certificate of Approval to remove. The chain link fence will be replaced with a wood picket fence, which the Guidelines recommend for use in the district. Staff has no objection to either fencing board style.

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends Approval as submitted.

**Testimony:** There was no testimony.

**Motion:** Mr. Roth moved to Approve the application. Mr. Shad seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

## **REGULAR AGENDA**

### **15-21 – 3713 Old Columbia Pike, Ellicott City (continued from April)**

Exterior repairs and alterations.

Applicant: Megan Reuwer

**Background & Scope of Work:** This application came before the Commission last month and was continued in order to receive additional information, as requested by the Commission. The exact date of construction of this building is unknown, but it shows up on the 1959 Sanborn maps. The building is concrete block construction and Staff does not find it to be of historic or architectural value to the district. Section 16.607 of the County Code states, “It is the intent of this subtitle (Standards for Review), that the Commission be strict in its judgment of plans for contributing structures. It is also the intent of this subtitle that the Commission shall be lenient in its judgment of plans for structures of little historic value or plans for new construction, except where such plans would seriously impair the historic or architectural value of surrounding structures or the surrounding area. It is not the intent of this subtitle to limit new construction, alteration or repairs to the architectural style of any one period.”

**Testimony:** Ms. Holmes stated the applicant, Megan Reuwer, requested a delay until June because Ms. Reuwer is still working with the architect to obtain the additional drawings.

### **15-28 – 1684 Woodstock Road, Woodstock**

Demolition of existing structure and new construction.

Applicant: Patrick Costello

**Background & Scope of Work:** According to MDAT the house dates to 1925. The Historic Sites Inventory form states that the property was purchased in 1897, but says that documentary evidence could not be found to date the building. This property is listed on the Historic Sites Inventory as HO-1070. The Applicant proposes to demolish the existing house and construct a new house. The house currently sits on almost 2 acres of land.

**Staff Comments:** The Howard County architectural historian has provided the following history on the

house:

The house is certainly consistent with the 1890-1910 period, being what has sometimes been referred to as a Homestead Ell house. The plan is basically a reversal of the traditional I-house with a rear ell, in that the ell is pushed to the front. In many cases, as with the Fairbank House, the front end of the ell is given a three-sided bay for visual interest. Other popular dwelling features of the period are used on these houses, and found here, as well, including the wrap-around porch, decorative brackets where the gable overhangs the clipped corners of the bay, gabled wall dormers, and pent roofs. The Fairbank House ell extends to the rear of the main block, forming a "T" plan and making it more spacious than some. It also contains a pantry extension off of the rear ell, with a porch tucked between the pantry and the main block (the porch is now closed in). This is a traditional farmhouse feature in the piedmont, such as Carroll and Frederick counties, but is rarely found in Howard County farmhouses.

Staff would prefer to see the house rehabilitated. [Ms. Holmes corrected the Staff Report stating the land cannot be subdivided; the minimum lot size is three acres]. The house could remain if the land was subdivided and a new home or development could be built on an empty lot or the adjacent property that Mr. Costello owns. Regardless, if the owner proceeds to demolish the house, Staff recommends the building materials be donated to an architectural salvage company.

**Testimony:** Ms. Tennor swore in Patrick Costello. Ms. Tennor asked if there were any additions or corrections to the Staff comments. Mr. Costello stated the only item, which Staff just corrected, is the land cannot be subdivided because it does not meet the minimum size of three acres. Mr. Reich asked the reason to demolish the house. Mr. Costello stated he had some inspectors evaluate the condition of the house. There is a lot of water damage and rot and termite damage which could cause problems structurally. Mr. Costello feels from a cost basis it would be more sensible to have the house razed, than to rehabilitate it. Mr. Roth asked if the house had been purchased recently. Mr. Costello purchased the house last year. Mr. Shad had no questions. Ms. Tennor asked if the house was purchased with the intent of demolishing it. Mr. Costello stated no; judgement on whether to retain or demolish was held off until a better idea could be obtained on the condition of the house and the amount of work to be done, and also if the current layout would work with an addition. Ms. Tennor asked if a report was obtained from the engineer that evaluated the house. Mr. Costello stated he did. Ms. Tennor asked that this report be given to Staff so they can evaluate what the engineer stated. Mr. Costello stated he would provide a copy of the report to Staff. Ms. Tennor commented at the end of the access road, there is a new house. Mr. Costello stated there are also two additional lots at the end of the road where two new houses will be built. Mr. Costello said there is a 2 acre lot already with a house, a 2.5 acre lot, and 3.25 acre lot which all service from the same road. Mr. Costello said there is a permit in DILP to build a house on the 2.5 acre lot.

Ms. Tennor commented she does not like losing another historic farmhouse, especially one that is rare to the County. The historic home is located in Woodstock, which contains many homes that have been rehabilitated. Mr. Costello clarified that the purchase of the property was an investment; he does not intend to live in the house. The idea was to rehabilitate and possibly add onto the house, but if this was not possible, it would be removed. Mr. Costello commented that neither he nor the previous owner knew that this house was on the historic inventory, and was never made aware of it. Mr. Costello also had an architect study the house to see if the architect could come up with any ideas regarding the house. The answer from the architect was that the house and the work would not be worth the amount of funds needed to update it. Mr. Reich asked what the setbacks are for new construction. Mr. Costello thinks they are 50 feet from the front property line and 10 feet from the side property line, but Zoning would have to confirm this. Mr. Costello said a new house could be at the same setback as the previous house was located. Mr. Reich said that if the entire house is removed, the County will require compliance with the new setbacks for construction. Mr. Reich stated there are a lot of components to deal with in new construction. Mr. Reich

asked about renovation versus construction. Mr. Costello stated the issue with renovation is that even if a large amount of funds were used to rehabilitate the house, there may be trouble selling the house. Mr. Reich advised the Applicant to study all the aspects of the project and the site costs. Mr. Reich suggested that modifying the interior partitions, building an addition, uncovering the original architectural features could produce a house that could be put on the market faster and for less costs than building a new house. Ms. Zoren asked how long the house has been vacant. Mr. Costello said the house has been vacant for over a year. Ms. Tennor suggested that Mr. Costello look into ways to save the house, if possible. Mr. Bennett showed a couple of pictures of materials from the interior of the house which are in excellent condition like the wood staircase and front door and inquired on Mr. Costello's intent for these architectural details. Mr. Costello stated a lot of the materials will be salvaged.

#### **15-29 – 8137 Main Street, Ellicott City (sign)**

Install sign.

Applicant: Randall Russell

**Background & Scope of Work:** According to MDAT the building dates to 1906. The Applicant proposes to install two signs on the front of the building. The first sign will be flat mounted and will replace the existing sign. The sign will be ½ inch thick routed MDF. The second sign will be a projecting sign hung from a black metal bracket on the side of the building. The sign will be MDF with acrylic letters. The bracket will extend 40 inches from the building and will be 14 inches high.

Both signs will be 2 feet high by 3 feet wide for a total of 6 square feet each. The signs will have a black background, with a gold border and gold text. The signs will read on 4 lines:

The  
Vintage  
Vault  
& Gallery

**Staff Comments:** The application complies with Chapter 11.A recommendations for signs, such as “use simple, legible words and graphics” and “use a minimum number of colors, generally no more than three. Coordinate sign colors with the colors used in the building façade.” The flat mounted sign will be 6 square feet, which complies with Chapter 11.B recommendations that flat mounted signs should not exceed 8 square feet in area. The projecting sign also complies with Chapter 11.B, which recommends, “limit the sign area to be in scale with the building. Projecting or hanging signs of four to six square feet are appropriate for many of Ellicott City’s small, attached commercial buildings.”

However, the Guidelines recommend against “two signs where one is sufficient to provide an easily visible identification of the business.” Staff finds the flat mounted sign is the most appropriate place for a sign and will replace the existing sign, not causing further damage to the historic building materials. If the Commission approves both signs, the hanging sign should be carefully located in the joints of the stone, so that holes are not visible if the sign is removed in the future.

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends Approval of flat mounted sign only.

**Testimony:** Ms. Tennor swore in Randall Russell. Ms. Tennor asked if there were any additions or corrections to the Staff comments. Mr. Russell stated the reason for having two signs is that the flat mounted sign is recessed and is not really visible from both sides of the street, plus many visitors walk right by the building and are not aware that any business exists. Mr. Russell finds that the hanging sign would be more visible to people farther up the street and on the opposite side of the street. Mr. Reich has no issues



with either sign and feels that both should be approved. Mr. Roth has no issues with the signs. Mr. Shad said he is also fine with the signs. Ms. Tennor stated that she does not find two signs to be necessary. She said the building itself is very prominent on Main Street and serves as its own sign. Ms. Tennor said if the flat mounted sign does not have the visibility needed, she suggested that the flat mounted sign could be tilted slightly forward to become more visible and give a more historic feel. Ms. Tennor would prefer not to have anything drilled into the stone façade, and does not like the asymmetrical signage.

Mr. Russell said that many other buildings on Main Street have hanging brackets. Ms. Tennor said that is true, but that this building does not have a hanging sign currently. He stated the effort is being made to try to preserve the building and preserve the character in the way the building is being used. The hanging sign will be placed on the façade in a way to minimize any damage to the building. Ms. Tennor said she would prefer to see just one sign and does not find the building is appropriate for a projecting sign. Ms. Zoren asked if the entrance could be restored. Mr. Russell stated he is not sure how well the remnants could be cleaned because there is a lot of adhesive showing on the stone from the previous sign coming down. It might be difficult to fix and he would prefer just to cover it up. Ms. Tennor asked if a decision had to be made for one sign would the Applicant be amenable to the projecting sign centered over the door, in lieu of the flat sign. Mr. Russell stated he would prefer to use the flat sign if he could only install one sign. Ms. Holmes reminded the Commission that the neighboring building came in a few months ago for three signs and the Commission only approved one. Mr. Russell said that it was his understanding that signs in the windows do not need approval, but since his building windows are too small for a sign and are covered in iron work, the only option is to have the signs on the outside. He said that is one reason why he is requesting two signs.

**Motion:** Mr. Reich moved to Approve the application as submitted for two signs. Mr. Roth seconded. Ms. Tennor opposed. The motion was approved by a vote of 4 to 1.

#### **15-30 – 3431 Church Road, Ellicott City**

New construction.

Applicant: Rob Brennan, AIA

**Background & Scope of Work:** According to MDAT the house dates to 1930. The Applicant proposes to build a new detached garage next to the house. The garage will be one story with a basement. The garage will essentially be in the basement/lower level and will be accessed at grade from the existing driveway. The second floor will also be at grade, walking out to the front yard. The architecture of the new garage will be compatible with the cottage style of the main house.

The garage will be located 25 feet from the existing house. The garage doors will be on the north elevation, on the ground/basement level facing the Linwood Center's new school building. The north elevation will not be visible. There will be a standing seam terne coated steel awning roof over the garage doors, with half round gutters. The wood brackets supporting the awning will be painted white. The garage doors will have 16 panels. The exposed foundation walls will be parged block walls.

The Applicant also proposes to install a wood gate at the end of the public portion of Church Road to keep people from driving onto the private road, which dead ends. The Applicant has had damage to this property as a result of people driving and turning around in the space.

The construction will include the following materials:

1. Siding – HardiePlank smooth lap siding in the color Sherwin Williams Fun Yellow (SH 6908). This color will match the asbestos siding on the existing house.

2. Roof - CertainTeed Fiberglass shingles in the color Weathered Wood to match the existing house.
3. Windows - Lepage white aluminum clad wood and will consist of 6/1 double hung windows, 6 lite casement windows and 4 lite fixed windows. All windows will have simulated divided lites.
4. Entry Doors and Patio Doors - White wood; 4 lites over 1 panel; 8 lite French doors.
5. Garage Doors – White wood, 16 panels.
6. Gutters and Downspouts - 6 inch half round and round white aluminum gutters with three inch white downspouts.
7. Awnings – Terne-coated steel standing seam roof.
8. Railings – Steel railing by door painted black.
9. Steps – Stone steps to match the stone on the existing house.
10. Driveway gate – Stained IPE wood with black hardware.
11. Retaining walls – Parged block with a stone cap.
12. Landscaping – evergreen shrubs and small flowering trees.

**Staff Comments:** The application complies with Chapter 7 recommendations for new construction, additions, porches and outbuildings. Chapter 7.C recommends, “new garages and sheds should follow the historic pattern of being detached from the main building and, if practical, located in a side or rear yard.” The proposed garage will be located in the side yard. The garage design also complies with Chapter 7.A recommendations, “for any building, design the addition so that its proportions (relationship of width to height), the arrangement of windows and doors, and the relations of solids (wall area) to voids (window area) are compatible with the existing structure. Use a roof design that complements the original roof line.” The garage has been designed to blend in and be compatible with the existing historic house. The materials proposed for the garage also comply with Chapter 7.A recommendations, “on any building, use exterior materials and colors (including roof, walls and foundations) similar to or compatible with the texture and color of those on the existing building. Avoid exact replication that would make an addition appear to be an original part of a historic building.” This building will not be an addition, but a freestanding garage. The proposed Hardieplank lap siding will be the most appropriate choice to be similar to the asbestos siding on the main house. The parged foundation, roof, windows and doors are also all in a style that will match and complement the existing house. The railings will be black metal, which complies with Chapter 9.D recommendations, “install open fencing, generally not more than five feet high, of wood or dark metal.”

The Guidelines do not specifically address the driveway gate. However, there was previously a wood gate in this same area. The gate will also be wood, a material frequently recommended by the Guidelines for fencing and building construction.

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends Approval as submitted.

**Testimony:** Ms. Tennor swore in Rob Brennan. Ms. Tennor asked if there were any additions or corrections to the Staff comments. Mr. Brennan had no comments. Mr. Reich stated the application was put together very well. All the aspects of the project fit together perfectly. The Commission had no questions or issues.

**Motion:** Ms. Tennor moved to Approve the application as submitted, with the exception of the labeling on the two drawings. Mr. Shad seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

Exterior alterations

Applicant: Matthew Kowalski

**Background & Scope of Work:** According to MDAT the house dates to 1980; the house is not historic, but is located within the Ellicott City Historic District. The Applicant proposes to expand the existing parking pad in order to accommodate the family's vehicles. The existing parking pad is asphalt and the extension would be paved in asphalt as well. The contractor will do the following work:

"Install a crushed stone gravel base as needed to produce 4" depth, sawcut edge to existing asphalt to produce finish joint, install 3" of 9.5mm Surface Hot Mix Asphalt then roll to properly compact, apply hot tar seal to joint."

The driveway will be extended 14 feet to the east and 31.6 feet from the rear of the driveway northeast to the road. On the west side the driveway would be extended 17.9 feet northwest to the street. The Applicant's goal is to be able to safely park and operate 3-4 cars on their property. The Applicant has explained that they have a young child and between visitors and family members there are often 3-4 cars in the current parking pad, which is a very tight space. The Applicant said that most people have to make numerous turns to get out of the driveway, which they find to be unsafe around their child. Recently they had a Howard County ambulance in the driveway, which had to back down the driveway as it was unable to turn around.

**Staff Comments:** This house is located off of Church Road on a private drive that serves two houses. The house and existing parking pad are located on top of a hill. Chapter 9.D of the Guidelines recommends, "where needed, install new residential driveways that are narrow (one lane) and follow the contours of the site to minimize the need for clearing and grading. If possible, locate off-street parking spaces in side or rear yards." This parking pad will be located in the side yard. Due to the topography of the land, it is not possible to expand the existing driveway in length. The only way to expand is to widen the driveway. The Guidelines recommend against, "new driveways, parking areas...or other features that substantially alter the setting of a historic building." The adjacent house is not historic, nor is the other house located on this private drive, which dates to 1959. The size of the proposed drive parking pad will be significantly larger than the existing and exceeds the recommendations in the Guidelines for being a narrow, one-lane drive. The parking pad will have a floor area very similar in size to the house. However, the expanded drive parking pad will not be visible from Church Road, due to the topography and it will not be highly visible from neighboring historic Mt. Ida due to the evergreen tree screening.

Staff is concerned about the additional surface area of asphalt that would be used in this project and suggests some alternatives, such as heavy duty pavers or a TrueGrid or Grasscrete system. If the entire existing asphalt parking pad is dug up and regraded, a continuous stained and/or stamped concrete pad could also be installed that is more aesthetically pleasing than asphalt and is more in keeping with a 20 foot parking depth by 40 foot width to accommodate 4 vehicles. A standard parking space is 9x18, so this proposed pad will be larger than needed for four cars. If the entire pad is redesigned from scratch, a more appropriate footprint may be possible, taking into account turning and backing out space.

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff has no objection to the expansion, but finds an alternative paving scheme or revised footprint would be most appropriate to expand.

**Testimony:** Ms. Tennor swore in Matthew Kowalski. Ms. Tennor asked if there were any additions or corrections to the Staff comments. Mr. Kowalski stated a large amount of funding went into redoing their house, so a cost effective way needed to be found in order to redo the parking situation, which was to use asphalt. Mr. Kowalski feels that since there are many other parking areas in Ellicott City which use asphalt, there should be no problem in using asphalt for his parking area. Mr. Kowalski shared extensive facts and his personal concern with child safety dealing with backing up in driveways. Mr. Reich stated the parking

pad proposal looks fine. He said that it is barely visible from the road, and there will only be a bit more water runoff with the additional asphalt. Mr. Reich has no issues with the parking area. Mr. Kowalski stated he also had concerns with the rain water and the vegetation will remain the same around the house to help with the water runoff. Mr. Reich commented that Staff had recommended different types of surface, but he does not think the asphalt surface would be a problem as it is barely visible. Mr. Reich asked how much more square feet of asphalt would be used. Mr. Kowalski stated the current driveway is 2400 square feet. The current parking pad is 648 square feet. The proposed parking pad would add about 760 square feet. This would be about a 24% increase in asphalt. Mr. Kowalski stated the goal is to be able to back in a vehicle in one maneuver and be able to turn around easier.

Mr. Shad asked if any quotes or pricing have been obtained for the alternative types of materials. Mr. Kowalski stated he has not. Ms. Burgess clarified the Staff's concern was not the visibility. The site could accommodate a lot of square footage, but since the parking pad would exceed the square footage of the house this seemed excessive and a different design, even with asphalt, may be better. The focus was really on the excessive amount of square footage. Ms. Zoren stated the material should be a consideration as adding 600+ square feet of impervious pavement to a small site in an area prone to floods and runoffs would cause a big impact. Ms. Zoren suggested the Applicant look into pervious pavement, such as Grasscrete or pavers. Mr. Reich suggested using pervious asphalt. Mr. Kowalski stated another concern is to be able to clear the parking area during winter weather and keep the area safe and to not have anyone slipping and falling. Mr. Roth asked about the number of cars that would be parked in the area. Mr. Kowalski stated normally only two cars, but they have out of town relatives that come to visit so additional cars would be parked. Mr. Roth stated he does not have any objection to the parking, but others in the area may. Mr. Roth said the Staff recommendations would be worth considering. Mr. Kowalski stated quotes will be obtained. It is very difficult at this time for any large vehicle, such as emergencies, to maneuver and turn around.

Ms. Tennor stated the proposed pad is a very large increase and asked if the Applicant really needs the increase for parking or for other vehicles. Mr. Kowalski stated it is a large increase in area, but due to the current size and terrain, it becomes very difficult if someone needed emergency service where the vehicle could not turn around. Ms. Tennor agreed that the area is not visible from the road, but said it is very unusual for a parking area to be this large. Ms. Tennor brought up the concern by the Applicant that a child would be less likely to be injured in a large paved area, rather than a smaller area. Mr. Kowalski stated the number of maneuvers needed to turn a vehicle around would be much less in a larger area, but in the current configuration, with cars parked, it takes multiple times to turn the car around safely, which increases the chance of hitting someone in a blind zone. Ms. Tennor asked about backing in the vehicle. Mr. Kowalski stated it helps a little, but does not solve the problem. Mr. Kowalski stated there is an easement on the property, which is 15 feet wide, but the easement cannot be used for parking. This would be a violation of the easement. Ms. Tennor asked if the Applicant would consider another configuration of the parking area, or if they've reviewed all of the alternatives to find a solution.

Mr. Taylor told the Applicant that the County has an office of Community Sustainability, which manages the storm water fee program. Staff can give the Applicant information to contact them. This office has a reimbursement program which can help pay for items such a pervious pavement, and may be able to come to the site and offer some alternatives with the configuration. Mr. Kowalski stated an issue with the configuration in trying to go back further is there is a very mature tree which he does not want to remove. The current proposed configuration was the best way to achieve the goal without disturbing any trees. Ms. Tennor asked if the Applicant is willing to consult with the County resources to see what can be recommended. Mr. Kowalski stated yes he is willing to talk to them. Ms. Tennor asked the Applicant if he is willing to do a continuation and return to the next month's meeting after consulting with the resources. Mr. Kowalski stated he would prefer to resolve the case now instead of continuing. Ms. Holmes stated the Commission can also add options in the motion to allow the Applicant choices per the Staff

recommendations, which would be contingent upon Staff approval.

**Motion:** Mr. Roth moved to Approve as submitted. Mr. Reich seconded. The motion was approved by a vote of 3 to 2. Ms. Tennor and Ms. Zoren opposed.

Mr. Taylor clarified the motion and asked if the motion includes the option for a smaller configuration and/or to use alternative paving to allow the Applicant the choice. Mr. Roth re-stated a new motion.

**Revised Motion:** Mr. Roth moved to Approve as submitted with the option of making a smaller pavement area or using alternative paving if the Applicant chooses to do so. Alternative paving or a smaller configuration would need to be approved by Staff. Mr. Reich seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

**15-32 – 3832 Old Columbia Pike, Ellicott City, HO-558**

Advisory Comments for subdivision without demolition.

Applicant: Hong Tao Ma

**Background & Scope of Work:** According to MDAT the house dates to 1860. This property is located within the Ellicott City Historic District. The Applicant proposes to subdivide the property into three buildable lots. Lot 1 will contain the existing historic house and two historic outbuildings. There will be one open space lot, which will be located behind Lot 1 and will be a total of 1.5409 acres. The total acreage of the site is 3.0624 acres and is zoned R-ED.

The plan at this time requires Advisory Comments for the subdivision, but will later require a Certificate of Approval before any structures can be built.

The two new lots will be accessed from a driveway located on the side of the property. Based on the configuration of the lots and driveway, it appears the new homes will face west, whereas the existing historic house faces south toward the street. The sides of the houses will face the street.

**Staff Comments:** The two new lots will be located in direct view of the historic house. The new houses, on shown on the site plan, will present the side of the house to the street. Staff recommends the lots be reconfigured to present the front of the house to the street and staggered so that they are not directly in front of the historic house. Staff finds the lot layout as presented is not compatible with the historic district or the historic houses that line the street outside of the district. The majority of the houses along Old Columbia Pike face the street.

While the Commission can only offer Advisory Comments for the subdivision and lot layout, it is important to remember that no structures can be built without the Commission's approval. Staff strongly recommends the Applicant consider all comments from the Commission regarding the lot layout, which will eventually affect the architecture of the new homes, which the Commission has the authority to approve or deny.

Front loading garages are also not appropriate or commonly found in the historic district. Staff recommends the layout of the lots provide for rear detached or side loading garages, as well as features such as front porches, which are commonly found in the district.

**Testimony:** Ms. Tennor swore in Charles Crocken, the engineer representing the owner. Mr. Crocken stated he reviewed the Staff's correspondence and would like to give a response regarding some points in the letter. Mr. Crocken said the Environmental Concept Plan (ECP) was submitted to the County and was

approved. The existing driveway is located closer to the bend in the roadway, with very limited site distance. In regard to subdividing the property, there were several issues – the driveway location is a hazard to the public being it is located among several houses; concerns about the forest, steep slope, possible floodplains; the location of the property in relation to Ellicott City. Mr. Crocken stated he did the ECP before coming to the Historic Commission for several reasons. He thought there was no floodplain on the property, but discovered there is a small floodplain at the bottom of the hill. Mr. Crocken thought the Historic District ended at the neighboring property. Mr. Crocken said the front of the historic house actually faces east; it is on the right-hand side where the parking is.

Mr. Crocken said the site was designed after reviewing the zoning; the property is zoned R-ED. The intent was to develop the property under R-20 zoning, which is permitted in the R-ED district. The original plan was done showing four lots; 50% of the property was being given to open space which allowed each lot size to be reduced. Mr. Crocken was informed if the R-20 zoning was going to be used, under the R-ED regulations, the subdivision would be considered an infill subdivision and would be subject to the infill regulations. Mr. Crocken said these regulations were actually changed during the process of preparing the ECP. The allowed lot size became a minimum of 20,000 square feet, and it was not possible to create 20,000 square foot lots within the 1½ acres, since the remainder of the acreage was given up. The result was a plan for a three lot minor subdivision with the density, lot size and configuration based on the R-ED zoning.

Mr. Crocken said that different configurations were reviewed in locating the houses. He explained that the houses were located to face the driveway to avoid the houses facing front to back. Mr. Crocken checked to see if the houses could fit in the building envelope if turned and they could fit. He said that all the houses can be turned to face the road, but the side of the house now becomes the rear. The rear yard setback is just 25 feet, so the rear yard would only be 25 feet from the back of the house to the property line. With the grading to be done for storm water management, this configuration would not work. Mr. Crocken stated another concern is this property is uphill from Ellicott City, and there is flooding from Tiber Run. A typical minor subdivision would design the storm drainage to accommodate the 10 year storm, but this plan would have to provide for a 100 year storm. He explained that it was not possible to design storm drainage on the hill to provide for that, so a bio-retention facility was designed for each backyard on each lot. Storm water management was provided to the maximum extent possible to satisfy the Maryland Department of the Environment, and was also approved by the Development Engineering Division. Mr. Crocken would like to have the front lot facing the road.

Mr. Burgess stated for clarification that Staff appreciates the garages being located on the side. Staff was looking more for a visual entrance from the road, rather than a literal switching of the house footprint. She explained that it involves more of the architectural features. Mr. Crocken stated he is trying to avoid the front to back configuration. The houses had been placed so that there was a clear view of the historic house in the back coming up the driveway, but the Development Engineering Division in Planning and Zoning preferred the houses to be closer to the use-in-common driveway to reduce the amount of paving needed. Mr. Reich asked how R-ED fixes the lot size. Mr. Crocken stated since 1½ acres have been given up, lot sizes can be reduced. R-ED will allow lot sizes to go down to 6,000 square feet as a minimum. The calculated net area is being used to produce reasonable sized lots. The lot for the historic house is larger, as it was given more area. Mr. Roth stated there are a lot of constraints to deal with, but keeping the character of the historic district also needs attention. Ms. Tennor asked about a setback line showing on the plan stating 40 foot BRL; is this as close to the road as is allowed. Mr. Crocken stated the actual road setback in R-ED for all structure and uses is 75 feet; R-20 zoning would have allowed a smaller setback. Mr. Crocken said this plan is subject to approval of a zoning variance from the 75 foot setback to a 40 foot setback for the front yard. The plan is also subject to a waiver of the driveway location for site distance, and a waiver for the storm water management to allow management of the 10 year storm with bio-retention facilities.

Mr. Roth stated the front entry driveway house does not belong in the historic district. This could become a problem, even though the entry does not face the road, as the entry is facing the neighbors. Ms. Holmes asked about the pre-submission meeting and how the neighbors reacted having the new structures located to look into their side yards. Mr. Crocken stated the neighbors did not have any major objections to the plan, plus at that time the plan had been for 4 lots. Mr. Crocken said that the plan at this point is not definite and depends on whether the variance and waivers are approved. Mr. Reich asked if there is a forested area. Mr. Crocken stated all the back (northern) area is forested. Mr. Reich asked about a delineation of steep slope. Mr. Crocken stated yes the slope will be 25% or greater. This area is set into the open space parcel which does not allow any building or disturbance. This is required by County Regulations.

Ms. Tennor commented about changing how the houses face and having a common driveway where Lot 3 faced the road and Lot 2 faced the historic house on Lot 1. Mr. Tennor asked the width of the driveway. Mr. Crocken stated the use-in-common portion of the driveway must be 16 feet wide. Once the driveway goes past the front lots, it can be narrowed down to 12 feet to serve the existing house. Ms. Holmes said that homes with backyards facing the street need to have screening to prevent seeing backyard activities. She asked the Applicant if he would be amenable to do additional landscape screening above what is required. Mr. Crocken stated yes, he would be amenable to additional landscape beyond what the Landscape Manual requires.

Mr. Shad appreciates that the historic home will not be demolished. He suggested that once architectural details are added to the new construction should be compatible with the existing house.

Mr. Roth said that the houses should face the road to be in keeping with the historic district. He stated that front loading garages are not appropriate and maintaining the character of the community neighborhood is needed.

Mr. Reich likes the suggestion that the house on Lot 3 face the road; the Lot 2 house face north. He suggested that the common driveway should wrap around and load Lot 2 from the north and Lot 1 from the south side of the existing house. Mr. Reich found this would be the best arrangement to keep with the historic district. Mr. Reich said he is opposed to the whole idea, and finds the plan should have been presented to the Commission much earlier in the planning process. Mr. Reich feels the optimum solution is to place the historic home in the front and move the other homes to the back.

Ms. Zoren stated when preparing the final layout is it urged to do rear or side garage access. Obtain Lot 2 access from existing, widened drive from the north. Face the wider side of Lot 3 to face parallel with Old Columbia Pike. Treat the side of the house as a true front entrance using items that would be appropriate on the front of a house like using symmetry in the design, including porches and quality materials. Preserve the view corridor to the existing historic home and not block the view.

Ms. Tennor stated she has nothing to add as her suggestions have already been incorporated by the other members.

#### ADDITIONAL BUSINESS

Grace Kubofcik, Fred Dorsey and Dick Tufts attended the meeting on behalf of the Preservation Advocates group. They spoke briefly with the Commission to discuss their plans for a demolition/demolition by neglect law.

Ms. Tennor moved to Adjourn the meeting. The motion was seconded. The meeting was adjourned at

9:02 p.m.

\*Chapter and page references are from the Ellicott City or Lawyers Hill Historic District Design Guidelines.

---

Beth Burgess, Executive Secretary

---

Eileen Tennor, Chairperson

---

Carol Stirn, Recording Secretary